

**ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS
BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS

-and-

MR STAVROS PASCHALIDIS MRCVS

DECISION ON FINDINGS OF FACT

Charges

1. Mr Paschalidis faced the following charges:

1. On 7 October 2021, in relation to Beluga, a Beagle dog:

- (a) Failed to carry out any or any adequate examination;
- (b) Failed to vaccinate Beluga;
- (c) Made entries in the clinical records for Beluga indicating that you had:
 - (i) examined Beluga; and/or
 - (ii) vaccinated Beluga,

when you had not done so in relation to either or both of the above;

2. On 7 October 2021, in relation to Simba, a Bengal cat:

- (a) Failed to carry out any or any adequate examination;
- (b) Failed to vaccinate Simba;
- (c) Confirmed to veterinary nurse KD that you had vaccinated Simba, when you had not done so;
- (d) Made entries in the clinical records for Simba indicating that you had
 - (i) examined Simba and/or
 - (ii) vaccinated Simba,

when you had not done so in relation to either or both of the above;

3. Your conduct in relation to 1(c) and/or 2(c) and/or 2(d) above was:
- (a) dishonest; and/or
 - (b) misleading

AND that in relation to the above, whether individually or in any combination, you are guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.

Summary of the College's case

2. Mr Paschalidis was engaged as a locum at Westside Veterinary Clinic, Battersea, London ("the Practice") from 27 September 2021 until 7 October 2021, when his contract was summarily terminated, and he was asked to leave.
3. On 6 October 2021, a staff meeting was held to discuss concerns which had arisen about Mr Paschalidis behaviour. He was not present at the meeting and the outcome of the meeting (not known to him) was to offer him additional support, and to increase his interactions with veterinary nurses and veterinary care assistants during his consultations.
4. On 7 October 2021, the COVID restrictions were in place and so the owners of patients did not enter the Practice.
5. Mr Paschalidis was dismissed from the Practice on 7 October 2021 because two staff members at the Practice said they had seen him recording that he had examined and vaccinated patients Beluga and Simba, when he had not, and one of them said she had seen Mr Paschalidis disposing of a vaccine into the sink, in relation to Simba. She also believed he had done so in relation to Beluga.
6. Ms D (RVN) (KD in the charges) and Ms B (a receptionist and kennel assistant) both watched Mr Paschalidis through the consulting room windows unknown to him. Ms D said she moved between two windows, Ms B said she watched the events from one window.
7. Ms D said she did not see Mr Paschalidis examine Beluga despite him noting in the clinical record that he had done so. She also said that Mr Paschalidis did not take the temperature of Beluga nor was any vaccination injection administered to Beluga. However she saw him clip Beluga's nails.
8. Ms B also said that she did not see Beluga vaccinated or examined having watched the consultation. Ms B did not see Mr Paschalidis clipping the dog's nails.
9. The clinical notes produced for Beluga, recorded "*didn't check T*" but Ms D said that she believed she had seen a value for the temperature when she looked at the notes immediately after the consultation. The notes record a full examination. There is also a record of a vaccination.

10. Ms D said she did not confront Mr Paschalidis straight away as she could not believe what she had seen. She waited and watched his consultation with Simba, the next patient.
11. In relation to Simba, both Ms D and Ms B said that Mr Paschalidis did not open the cat basket at all. Both Ms D and Ms B said that they did not see Mr Paschalidis examine Simba. Both said that Mr Paschalidis did not vaccinate Simba.
12. The clinical notes for Simba, record '*stavros paschalidis locum vet notes*'. The notes record a clinical examination.
13. Ms D said she saw Mr Paschalidis squirt the vaccine for Simba down the sink. She says as a result of this she confronted Mr Paschalidis. Ms D asked Mr Paschalidis if he had given the vaccine to Simba and he said he had.
14. Ms D went to speak to Ms M (MRCVS) to report that she believed that Mr Paschalidis had not kept accurate records and she had seen him not vaccinating at least one patient.
15. There was a confrontation in which Mr Paschalidis admitted wrongdoing to staff at the practice.
16. Ms D said that Mr Paschalidis admitted to her that he had squirted a vaccination down the sink for Beluga. She told him that she had seen him squirt the cat's vaccine down the sink too but he denied it.
17. Ms M said that Mr Paschalidis admitted to her that he had squirted vaccines down the sink in relation to both Beluga and Simba and that he did not examine both Beluga and Simba. She said he apologised and said words to the effect that he didn't know why he had done it.
18. Ms M completed the vaccination for Simba and the consultation. Mr Paschalidis was summarily dismissed from the practice.
19. Ms M reported the matter to the locum agency and took advice from the Veterinary Defence Society (VDS) regarding the possible failure to vaccinate these and/or other animals. She also spoke to the Regional Director at Vet Partners.
20. Ms D reported the matter in a written record to the College on the 7 October 2021 and she informed the Regional Director at Vet Partners as well. Ms B typed up a note on her computer of the events.

Summary of the Respondent's case

21. Mr Paschalidis' response to the College dated 5 November 2022 is that he had not thrown any vaccine away. In his statement dated 30 June 2023, he said he gave a vaccination to Beluga and he believes he may have prepared a vaccination for Simba

but he could not recall if he squirted it down the sink having decided to perform Simba's blood tests first.

22. Mr Paschalidis said he had examined Beluga. He thought he might have administered a worming tablet to Simba but he had not completed the consultation because it was interrupted by Ms D. He denied throwing away any vaccine in relation to Beluga, although he said he might have squirted one vaccine down the sink in relation to Simba. He denied telling Ms D that he had vaccinated Simba when she first confronted him.
23. He could not remember exactly what happened with either animal and he left open a number of possibilities. The Respondent's case was that staff had missed seeing elements of his examination of Beluga. He said for Simba his examination was interrupted.
24. Mr Paschalidis also said he normally typed a template or he cut and pasted notes from other records, pre-examination, as a check list, which he then amended. He admitted that the way he wrote clinical records was open to criticism saying "*I do accept that the method I use to record the clinical records may be open to some criticism as I now appreciate that it increases the risk of an entry being added pre-emptively which may then, inadvertently, either not be corrected or removed*".
25. He said that he had tried to resolve matters in discussion with Ms D, but found her to be unwilling to listen. Mr Paschalidis denied admitting to any staff at the practice that he had not vaccinated Beluga or Simba, but he did say that when he spoke to Ms D he ironically said he had not vaccinated Beluga, but he said that was "*not an admission of guilt rather an irony to her surreal allegations which I strongly deny*".
26. He said the clinical notes in relation to Beluga were made by him but only parts of the notes in relation to Simba were made by him.

Mr Jamieson on behalf of Mr Paschalidis relied on the difficulties in lines of sight by both Ms D and Ms B, inconsistencies in evidence between them and a lack of supporting evidence from other staff members or details as to how the computer record for Simba was finalised. He also submitted that witnesses saw what they were expecting to see rather than what they actually saw and he submitted that Mr Paschalidis had always denied any purported confession to any staff members.

27. Mr Jamieson also relied on the good character of Mr Paschalidis and the fact that there were some inconsistencies between the witnesses. He did not allege that the witnesses were lying or colluding.

Admissions

28. At the start of the hearing, Mr Paschalidis admitted Charge 2(d)(i). He denied that the record was misleading or dishonest because he said he was interrupted in making the notes by Ms D when she confronted him. He said that therefore his notes were a draft which were incomplete.

The Committee's findings of fact and reasons

29. The Committee took into account the oral and written submissions made by Mr Weston on behalf of the College and by Mr Jamieson on behalf of Mr Paschalidis.
30. The Committee noted that Mr Jamieson relied heavily on the fact that there was no motive or reason for why Mr Paschalidis would have committed the acts alleged in the charges..
31. The Committee decided that in order to determine the charges it did not have to discover a motivation for Mr Paschalidis' conduct as part of its decision making, it was required only to decide whether the facts contained within the charges were proven to the highest civil standard; so that it was sure.
32. The Committee read the testimonial evidence which was relevant to Charge 3(a) and took into account that Mr Paschalidis had no previous disciplinary findings against him and that he was of previous 'good character'. It considered several testimonials that described his positive qualities.

Charge 1(a) – Failed to carry out any or any adequate examination of Beluga

33. The Committee took into consideration that both Ms B and Ms D had differing viewing points and that each remembered Ms D's location differently. The Committee also noted that Ms D stated that the dog was up against the consulting room door when Mr Paschalidis clipped Beluga's nails. Ms B said that Mr Paschalidis did not leave his computer during the consultation and that she did not see that Beluga's nails were clipped. Ms D did not see Mr Paschalidis use a stethoscope and she had not seen him with a stethoscope that morning.
34. Although Ms B did not see Mr Paschalidis clip Beluga's nails, the Committee was not persuaded that this meant that none of what she said was accurate. It decided that it could accept parts of her evidence since she was doing her best to assist the Committee.
35. Mr Paschalidis stated that he had examined the animal on the floor around the time he was clipping Beluga's nails. Mr Paschalidis said he had used his stethoscope to listen to the chest. Although evidence was heard that it was possible to examine an animal very quickly, the Committee was not persuaded that Mr Paschalidis' examination as described by Ms D could have been an adequate examination or that he listened to Beluga's chest at all using a stethoscope.
36. Both witnesses said that Mr Paschalidis had not examined Beluga and even though the Committee accepted that it was possible to carry out a quick examination whilst on the floor it was sure that listening to Beluga's chest using a stethoscope was not something Ms D would have failed to notice.

37. The Committee also was not persuaded that both eye witnesses would have missed seeing an examination or vaccination if it had taken place.
38. The Committee also took into account that Mr Paschalidis told Ms M when speaking to her alone, that he had not examined or vaccinated both Beluga and Simba. Although Mr Paschalidis denied he had said this, the Committee decided that it was sure he had done so and it did not accept that she would have been wrong about this admission because it was a detailed admission. Similarly it decided that she would not have fabricated it.
39. The events which followed thereafter supported the fact that Mr Paschalidis had made an admission to Ms M because it explained why she would have been so concerned about his conduct regarding other animals. Ms M said that following the admission from Mr Paschalidis to her, she had asked Mr Paschalidis to identify any other animals where this had happened and he told her it was only the two animals: Beluga and Simba. Despite this, she said she began to draw up a list of other animals that Mr Paschalidis had seen. In the Committee's view that was a logical investigation for the practice to make after what two staff members said they had seen in addition to what Mr Paschalidis had told Ms M.
40. The Committee also took into account that Mr Paschalidis accepted that he had admitted not vaccinating two animals to Ms D, although he explained he had made such an admission ironically. The Committee was not persuaded that, following on from his admission to Ms M, Mr Paschalidis was being ironic when he spoke to Ms D. It decided that it was sure that Mr Paschalidis had admitted that he had failed to vaccinate Beluga and Simba both to Ms M and to Ms D. It was therefore not persuaded that his admission to Ms D was ironic because it followed on from a similar admission to Ms M.
41. The Committee also noted that Mr Paschalidis stated to the College on 5 November 2022 that he had thoroughly examined and vaccinated Beluga. In evidence he described a cursory examination, not seen by Ms D who was covertly watching. This was another reason why it rejected his defence that this was an adequate examination even for a vaccination consultation.
42. The Committee decided on the evidence from both Ms D and Ms B that it was satisfied so that it was sure that there had been no adequate examination of Beluga. It concluded that any examination by Mr Paschalidis of Beluga could only have been a very quick examination and it was sure that he did not use a stethoscope or this would have been seen by one or both witnesses.
43. The Committee was therefore satisfied that Mr Paschalidis had not performed an adequate examination on Beluga, because he had failed to use his stethoscope, despite recording a finding that suggested he had done so, and admitted to Ms M that he had not examined.
44. The Committee therefore found this allegation proved.

Charge 1(b) Failed to vaccinate Beluga

45. The Committee found this allegation proved. It did so on the basis of the evidence from both Ms D and Ms B. It also did so on the basis of his separate admissions made to Ms M and to Ms D.
46. The Committee also considered carefully what Mr Paschalidis had said about his practice of vaccinating and examining animals. It noted that he said in his statement dated 30 June 2023 that while cutting Beluga's nails he had the chance to quickly check her mouth, chest, and abdomen. He then updated the clinical record and proceeded to administer the vaccination. He then completed the clinical record after he had administered the vaccine.
47. In his evidence in chief before the Committee, Mr Paschalidis said that, after he administered the vaccine, he would have crossed the room to put the syringe into the sharps box. In cross examination before the Committee he confirmed that he would not have examined the animal after vaccinating it and he said that he had done the vaccination last but he might have put the syringe in his pocket.
48. The Committee concluded that Ms D and Ms B would have seen Mr Paschalidis cross the room after preparing the vaccine and they would have seen him give the vaccination to Beluga if this had taken place. Since both of them said that they did not see the vaccine administered and both denied it being administered when they were cross examined, the Committee decided that it was sure the vaccine was not given to Beluga. It did not accept that Ms B and/ or Ms D would have missed that happening as it would have required Mr P to come towards Beluga with the syringe and needle, and no one saw him do that.
49. Mr Paschalidis was seen by the sink with the vaccine by Ms D, although Ms D said she did not see the vaccine squirted into the sink after she saw Mr Paschalidis draw up the vaccine, and she did not see him go towards Beluga with it. Ms D also explained that she then decided to watch Mr Paschalidis' consultation with Simba because she could not believe what she had seen.
50. The Committee also took into account that Ms B did not see Mr Paschalidis vaccinate Beluga.
51. Although the Committee thought a vaccination could be done very quickly, it would have required Mr Paschalidis to draw up the vaccine on one side of the room by the sink and then return to the animal and vaccinate it without having been seen. The Committee was sure that this would have been observed by Ms D and/or Ms B if Mr Paschalidis had done it. It noted that Mr Paschalidis accepted he would have drawn up the vaccine after examining the animal. It was not persuaded that both witnesses would have missed both the examination of the animal and the vaccination of the animal.
52. The Committee also took into account that Mr Paschalidis told Ms M when speaking to her alone, that he had not vaccinated both Beluga and Simba. Although Mr

Paschalidis denied he had said this, the Committee decided that it was sure he had done so.

53. What followed thereafter supported the fact that he had made such an admission to Ms M because it explained why she would have been concerned about his conduct regarding other animals. Ms M explained that she had asked Mr Paschalidis to identify any other animals where this had happened and he said it was only two animals. She also said she began to draw up a list of other animals that Mr Paschalidis had seen. In the Committee's view that was a logical investigation for the practice to make after Ms D said what she had seen and heard in addition to what Mr Paschalidis had told Ms M.
54. The Committee also took into account that Mr Paschalidis accepted that he had admitted not vaccinating two animals to Ms D, although he explained he had made such an admission ironically. The Committee was not persuaded that, following on from his admission to Ms M, Mr Paschalidis was being ironic when he spoke to Ms D. It decided that it was sure that Mr Paschalidis had admitted that he had failed to vaccinate Beluga and Simba both to Ms M and to Ms D. It was therefore not persuaded that his admission to Ms D was inaccurate despite his explanation that he was being ironic. It concluded that Mr Paschalidis had admitted to both witnesses that he had not vaccinated either Beluga or Simba.

Charge 1(c)(i) – Made entries in the clinical records for Beluga indicating that you had examined Beluga when you had not done so.

55. Having decided that Mr Paschalidis had not adequately examined Beluga, the Committee decided that this charge was proved because Mr Paschalidis admitted writing the notes for Beluga and the notes recorded an examination which he had not done.
56. There was no suggestion by Mr Paschalidis or by others, that anyone else had completed the notes in respect of Beluga.
57. It therefore found Charge 1(c)(i) proved.

Charge 1(c)(ii) – Made entries in the clinical records for Beluga indicating that you had vaccinated Beluga when you had not done so.

58. The Committee, having found that Mr Paschalidis did not vaccinate Beluga, found this charge proved because there was an entry in the clinical record for Beluga that Mr Paschalidis had administered a vaccine.
59. There was no suggestion by Mr Paschalidis or by others, that anyone else had completed the notes in respect of Beluga and the notes recorded a vaccination had been administered.

**Charge 2(a) Failed to carry out any or any adequate examination of Simba
Charge 2(b) Failed to vaccinate Simba**

60. The Committee carefully considered the different accounts Mr Paschalidis had advanced in respect of what he did with Simba. It noted that initially in his response to the College (5 November 2022) he said '*Ms D and Ms B are only right about me not opening Simba's basket and not examining him*'. He then said in his statement to the College dated 30 June 2023:

- *I cannot now recall every detail of the consultation, I recall giving Simba a worming tablet. I do not remember whether I gave the tablet in the basket or outside the basket. (paragraph 20)*
- *I think I also took Simba from his basket and examined him but he was not sure about this. (paragraph 20)*
- *I cannot recall now whether I prepared a vaccine for Simba. It is likely that I could have prepared a vaccine and left this close to the sink whilst I sought assistance with Simba's blood tests but I cannot be 100 per cent certain on this.*
- *Due to the passage of time since the events... I cannot now recall whether I prepared a vaccine for Simba and subsequently disposed of this down the sink in order to take Simba's blood tests.*

61. The Committee noted that Mr Paschalidis stated in his evidence to the Committee that he believed he had wormed Simba but that he had not taken Simba out of his basket. He said he could not remember if he had prepared the vaccine. He said if he had prepared it, it was possible he had disposed of it.

62. Having considered all of these accounts, the Committee did not believe Mr Paschalidis' evidence about examining or vaccinating Simba. It did not accept that the interruption to the consultation by Ms D was the reason why he had not examined Simba since he had not removed Simba from the basket and he would have needed to do so prior to vaccinating him. It was satisfied that Mr Paschalidis had a duty to examine and vaccinate Simba and the interruption to the consultation was only because he had not done so, and Ms D had seen him draw up and immediately dispose of a vaccination by this point. It therefore concluded that he had neither examined Simba nor vaccinated Simba.

63. Ms M was asked by the Committee how long it would take for a vaccination to become un-useable such that it would need to be disposed of – she said it might take 20-30 minutes for a vaccination to reach room temperature by which time it might need to be disposed of. Mr Paschalidis said the vaccination could not be placed in the fridge to keep cool because it was a fridge that stored vials only and it did not have a shelf.

64. The Committee concluded so that it was sure that Mr Paschalidis had drawn up the vaccine and disposed of it down the sink because Ms D said she had seen him do so. It was not persuaded that he would have done this because he was going to take bloods first or that the vaccination would reach room temperature in the time that elapsed so that it might need to be disposed of. There was no other reason advanced by Mr Paschalidis as to why he might have disposed of the vaccine if he was going to take bloods. There was no suggestion by him that taking bloods even after waiting for assistance would take longer than 20-30 minutes.

65. Furthermore neither Ms D nor Ms B saw the cat come out of the basket, or any worming of Simba, or any vaccination of Simba.
66. The Committee also took into account that Ms M said that Mr Paschalidis had told her he had failed to examine and vaccinate Simba. He had also said that to Ms D. For the reasons set out above the Committee took into account that evidence as supporting the observation evidence given by Ms B and Ms D.
67. The Committee was therefore satisfied so that it was sure that Simba was not vaccinated.
68. It therefore found Charge 2(a) and Charge 2(b) proved.

Charge 2(c) – Confirmed to veterinary Nurse KD that you had vaccinated Simba, when you had not done so

69. Ms D gave evidence to say that she asked Mr Paschalidis directly whether he had given the vaccination to Simba and he said yes. This was, she said, just after she went into the room to confront him having seen him flush the vaccination down the sink.
70. Mr Paschalidis did not agree that he had told Ms D that he had vaccinated Simba. However, the Committee noted the evidence of Ms B, in respect of what she had heard, and that this supported the evidence of Ms D.
71. Ms B said she heard Ms D saying “*no you didn’t, because I’ve just seen you flush that vaccination down the sink*” “*or words to that effect*” after she heard Ms D confront Mr Paschalidis. The Committee was therefore satisfied so that it was sure that Mr Paschalidis, having not given a vaccination to Simba, did tell Ms D that he had done so, in an attempt to persuade her that he had not done anything wrong. This was partly heard by Ms B.
72. The Committee did not consider there was any reason to doubt the veracity of what Ms D and Ms B said in relation to this confrontation. It was not persuaded that Mr Paschalidis would have simply said ‘*this is ridiculous*’ or ‘*why would I do that*’ because it considered, if he had been wrongly accused, he would have denied doing so or he would have admitted disposing of the vaccine down the sink for a particular reason had he had a good reason for doing so.
73. The Committee was therefore satisfied that Mr Paschalidis, having not vaccinated Simba and having been seen by Ms D and Ms B to have not done so, tried to pretend that he had vaccinated Simba when confronted by Ms D.
74. Having decided that Mr Paschalidis later told both Ms D and Ms M that he had not vaccinated Simba, the Committee also did not accept Mr Paschalidis’ evidence that he may have had a legitimate explanation for not vaccinating Simba.
75. The Committee therefore found Charge 2(c) proved.

Charge 2(d)(i) Made entries in the clinical records for Simba indicating that you had examined Simba when you had not done so

76. The Committee found Charge 2(d)(i) proved on the basis of the clinical note and the admission made by Mr Paschalidis.

Charge 2(d)(ii) Made entries in the clinical records for Simba indicating that you had vaccinated Simba when you had not done so

77. The Committee noted that the entry in the clinical records for Simba's vaccination was similar to that made and admitted to have been made by Mr Paschalidis for Beluga. However it noted that Simba's vaccination was later given by Ms M after the confrontation with Mr Paschalidis and Ms D. It was also unclear from the clinical record as to whether the notes had been altered after the confrontation and if so by whom. Evidentially there was some dispute as to who had written which part of the notes and the computer system for logging who had entered the note at the time of the vaccination was unclear. The Committee could therefore not be satisfied to the required standard of proof, so that it was sure, that Mr Paschalidis had made this entry in the clinical notes.

78. It therefore found Charge 2(d)(ii) not proved.

Charge 3(a) and 3(b) – dishonesty and/or misleading: in relation to Charge 1(c)(i) – made entries in the clinical records for Beluga indicating you had examined Beluga when you had not done so

79. Since the Committee had found Charge 1(c)(i) proved, it went on to consider if Mr Paschalidis was dishonest or misleading in his entries in the clinical records indicating that he had examined Beluga when he had not.

80. It applied the test for dishonesty in respect of the notes of the clinical examination and found that Mr Paschalidis must have known he was being dishonest by noting an examination of the chest when he had not listened to it. The notes also suggested that he had conducted a thorough examination when he had not done so and therefore he must have known when writing them that they were untrue. Anyone else considering these notes would therefore find such conduct to be objectively dishonest. It therefore found him to be dishonest. The Committee therefore found Charge 3(a) proved in relation to Charge 1(c)(i).

81. The Committee further concluded that the notes were misleading because the Committee was sure that Mr Paschalidis could not have examined Beluga's chest but the notes said 'chest clear'. It therefore found Charge 3(b) proved in relation to Charge 1(c)(i).

Charge 3(a) and Charge 3(b) – dishonesty and/or misleading in relation to Charge 1(c)(ii) – made entries in the clinical records for Beluga indicating you had vaccinated Beluga when you had not done so.

Charge 3(a) and Charge 3(b) – dishonesty and/or misleading in relation to Charge 2(c) – confirmed to veterinary nurse KD that you had vaccinated Simba when you had not done so.

82. The Committee applied the test for dishonesty set out in Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords [2017] UKSC 67. It decided that Mr Paschalidis must have known he was acting dishonestly when he wrote in the clinical record for Beluga that he had vaccinated Beluga when he had not done so. The Committee explored in evidence with Mr Paschalidis whether he had been distracted by his personal difficulties and he said he had not.
83. The Committee also considered that Mr Paschalidis' mention of personal difficulties was not relevant to anything other than why he would not have done something he was meant to do; which he denied.
84. The Committee was satisfied so that it was sure that when he had written in the clinical record for Beluga that a vaccination had been given when he had not given it, he must have known that to be dishonest. It was further satisfied that applying the standards of ordinary decent people, such conduct was objectively dishonest. It found no other explanation as to why Mr Paschalidis would have acted in that way.
85. The Committee was also satisfied that when Mr Paschalidis admitted to Ms D in relation to Simba that he had given a vaccination when he had not done so, he must have known he was being dishonest. It was further satisfied that applying the standards of ordinary decent people, that was objectively dishonest.
86. The Committee therefore found Charge 3(a) proved in relation to Charge 1(c)(ii) and in relation to Charge 2(c).
87. The Committee decided that such conduct was also misleading because confirmation of having given a vaccine either in the clinical record, or orally to Ms D, when it had not been given, was objectively misleading due to the consequences for the animal and also misleading for the owners.
88. It therefore found Charge 3(b) proved in relation to Charge 1(c)(ii) and in relation to Charge 2(c).

Charge 3(a) and Charge 3(b) – dishonesty and/or misleading - in relation to Charge 2(d)(i) – made entries in the clinical records for Simba indicating you had examined Simba when you had not done so.

89. Mr Paschalidis stated that the notes in respect of Simba were incomplete and in draft form because his consultation with Simba was interrupted by Ms D. He accepted making notes in the clinical record about an examination of Simba which he had not completed. He said that he had used an earlier record or a template for his clinical record with Simba which he would have amended had he not been interrupted by Ms D. The Committee noted that the clinical record showed that Simba had been given a worming tablet, it also recorded information about Simba's ears, eyes, teeth, skin, coat, chest, abdomen, mucous membranes, capillary refill time, hydration, heart and heart rate. There was a numerical value recorded for the capillary refill time and the heart rate.
90. There was some evidence that some parts of Simba's notes were written by Mr Paschalidis and other parts were written by Ms M. A trainee veterinary nurse was signed in as the author of the clinical record. There was some evidence that the last person to enter notes on the clinical record was the author of it. The Committee found this evidence unclear.
91. The Committee noted Mr Paschalidis' admission that he had made entries about the examination of Simba in the clinical record, including pre-populating it in relation to a clinical examination, when he had not yet examined Simba. It also noted that he agreed that his previous method of cutting and pasting or using a template and then amending it was misleading.
92. It went on to consider whether his conduct was dishonest or misleading. The Committee decided it was not satisfied to the requisite standard, that Mr Paschalidis was acting dishonestly. The Committee had some doubts about whether Mr Paschalidis' intention was to amend the record further because he had not completed it since the consultation was interrupted. It therefore decided that it was not sure Mr Paschalidis had been dishonest in relation to his entries regarding examining Simba.
93. However the Committee was satisfied that, even if he was planning to examine Simba further, he had made specific entries in the record which were, even if an incomplete record, objectively misleading because they indicated that Simba had already been examined.

94. It therefore found Charge 3(a) in relation to Charge 2(d)(i) not proved but Charge 3(b) in relation to Charge 2(d)(i) proved.

Charge 3 – dishonesty and/or misleading in relation to Charge 2(d)(ii) – made entries in the clinical records for Simba indicating you had vaccinated Simba when you had not done so

95. Since the Committee had found Charge 2(d)(ii) not proved, it found Charge 3(a) and Charge 3(b) not proved.

96. In summary therefore, the Committee found the following facts proved:

Charge 1(a), Charge 1(b), Charge 1(c)(i), Charge 1(c)(ii), Charge 2(a), Charge 2(b), Charge 2(c), Charge 2(d)(i), Charge 3(a) and Charge 3(b) in relation to Charge 1(c)(i), Charge 3(a) and Charge 3(b) in relation to Charge 1(c)(ii), Charge 3(a) and 3(b) in relation to Charge 2(c), Charge 3(b) in relation to Charge 2(d)(i).

97. The Committee found the following facts not proved:

Charge 2(d)(ii), Charge 3(a) in relation to 2(d)(i), Charge 3(a) and Charge 3(b) in relation to 2(d)(ii).

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE
10 July 2023